VIRGINIA ARGUS.

No 87, OF VOL. IV.] A FREE PRESS MAINTAINS THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE. [WHOLE No. 308.

RICHMOND (VIRG.)—PRINTED (ON TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS) BY SAMUEL PLEASANTS, JUN. NEAR THE VENDUE-OFFICE.

Four Dollars Per Annu[m.] TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1797. [Ten Cents Single.

DOCUMEN[TS]

Which accompanied the mess[age] of the Presi-dent of the United States to both Houses of Congress.

January 19, 1797.

Letter from the Secretary of State, [to] Mr. Pinck-ney Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the French Republic.

(Concluded from our last.)

WE see then that in forming [con]nections with us in 1778, the court of F[rance], the actual organ of the nation, had no [re]gard to the interest of the United States: b[ut] that their object was, by seizing the occasion of dismembering the British Empire to diminish the power of a formidable rival: and that [when] after we had carried on a distressing [war] for seven years, the great object for which [we] had contended, independence was within our reach, that court endeavored to postpone the acknowledgment of it by Great Britain, and eventually to deprive us of its fairest fruits—[by] a just extent of territory—the navigation of the Missisippi, and the Fishery.

Such being the motives and conduct of France what inspired our truly grateful sentiments towards that nation? The ardent affection, the sincere friendship of American to Frenchmen? We are engaged in a common cause against Great Britain—we received loans of money, we were aided by troops and ships in attacking and conquering the common enemy in the bosom of our country, and this association in war produced acquaintances and personal friendships: and experiencing these benefits, we gave way to our feelings, without enquiring into the motives from which they were rendered.

But why are we so often reminded [of] a claim of gratitude? Is it really because gratitude—because *compensation* is expected to cancel it? If compensation is the object, the treaty of alliance has absolved [us] from the claim—"The contracting parties declare that being resolved to fulfil, each on its own part, the clauses and conditions of the present treaty of alliance, according to its own power and circumstances, *there shall be no after demand of compensation*, on one side or the other, whatever may be the event of the war."

I am here naturally led to notice Mr. Adet's charge already mentioned: *That we have not offered to France the succours which friendship might have given, without compromitting the government.*

If Mr. Adet had specified the kind of succours which might have been offered, we could better judge the correctness of his assertion.

But is it true that we have rendered no succours to France? Read the following passages in the secretary of state's letter of the 16th of August, 1793, to Mr. Morris. "We recollect with satisfaction, that in the course of [two] years, by unceasing exertions, we paid [the] principal arrearages and instalments of our debt to France, which the inefficacy of our first government had forced to be accumulating: that pressing on first to the entire [fulfilment] of our engagements, we had [even] before the Genet the effect of the [last] instalment sent year to enable him to [relieve] fellow citizens in France, threatened [with] famine: that in the first moment of the [insurrection] which threatened the colony of St. Domingo, we stepped forward to their relief with arms and money, taking freely on ourselves the risk of an unauthorised aid, when delay would have been a denial"—that we have given the exclusive admission to sell here the prizes made by France on her enemies in the present war, tho' unstipulated in our treaties, and unfounded in her own practice or in that of other nations as we believe.

To this detail I have to add, That of all the loans and supplies received from France in the American war, amounting nearly to fifty-three millions of livres, the United States, under their late government had been enabled to pay not two millions and a half of livres; that the present government after paying up the arrearages and instalments mentioned by Mr. Jefferson, has been continually anticipating the subsequent instalments, until in the year 1795, the whole of our debt to France was discharged, by anticipating the payments of eleven millions and a half livres; no part of which would have become due until the 2d of September 1796, and then only one million and a half; the residue at subsequent periods; the last not until the year 1802.

There remain yet various passages in Mr. Adet's notes on which some observations are to be made.

In my letter of the 1st of November last, in answer to Mr. Adet's note of October 27th in which he communicated the decree of the executive directory of the 2d of July last, declaring that the flag of the republic of France, should treat the flag of neutrals in the same manner as these shall suffer it to be treated by the English, I asked an explanation of the decree; mentioning the circumstances which excited doubts. There seemed to be sufficient cause for enquiry: had the decree referred to the *past* captures by the English, our knowledge of *them* would have been some guide in forming our opinion of the threatened captures by the French: but the operation of the decree was to depend on the *future* conduct of the English: the French were to treat the flag of neutrals as these *shall* suffer it to be treated by the English. As this could not be ascertained before hand, we wished to know whether the restraints then exercised by the English Government were considered as of a nature to justify a denial of those rights which were pledged to us by our treaty with France? Whether the orders had actually been given to capture the vessels of the U. States? And if given, what were the precise terms of those orders? Mr. Adet, in his reply, says that I appear not to have understood either the decree of the directory or his note which accompanied it. The meaning of the decree is certainly very obvious. The manner of executing it, was declared to depend on a contingency—the future conduct of the English. How were French cruisers in the four quarters of the world to determine what was the conduct of the English at any given time. If he could have furnished a copy of the orders actually given to French armed vessels, under the decree, we might have seen clearly what were the intentions of the directory. If we are to take the practice of the French armed vessels and of some of the French tribunals as the true illustration of the decree, Mr. Adet's own explanation will be very defective: he has specified only two cases, the taking of English (or other enemy's) property on board American vessels and the seizure of all the goods classed as contraband in our treaty with Great Britain. In the case of contraband goods the seizure of them is lawful only when they are destined to the ports of their enemies; and the *contraband goods only* are liable to confiscation. But the special agents of the directory in the West Indies order the seizure of all vessels having on board [illegible] destined to an enemy's, or a neutral, or even to a French port; and when seized, they confiscate not merely the contraband articles, but all other goods and the vessel herself in which they are laden. They also assign as their sources of capture and condemnation—that the American vessel has sailed to or from a port in possession of the English. We are not informed that the English take any neutral vessels for this cause. We have heard of several American vessels being captured and confiscated by the French merely because they had not a sea-letter, when no doubt could have been entertained of the property being American. Yet it is conceived that the want of a sea-letter was never intended to exclude other proofs of property.

Further, ought we to have imagined that the executive directory intended to leave it to the discretion of every privateer and of every petit jurymen to judge what at any time [illegible] to their decree was the *actual* treatment [illegible] American vessels from the British? Ought we to have imagined that the decree was framed in such indefinite terms on purpose to give scope for arbitrary construction, and consequently for unlimited oppression? Ought we to have imagined what Mr. Adet has himself declared to be the meaning of the decree, that the French armed vessels were not to content themselves with capturing American vessels having English property or contraband goods on board, and getting such property and goods confirmed by their tribunals; but if any English commanders were to practice "*vexations*" towards Americans, that Frenchmen were to do the same? Ought we to have imagined that the directory intended the citizens of France should be encouraged to take revenge on their friends for the outrages of their enemies? And what is to limit these vexations? If one English commander in a hundred perversely and wantonly abuses his power,—is every French officer to become his rival in dishonour? Or if we are to suffer only measure for measure (and surely the decree goes not beyond this) who is to designate the every hundredth French officer who is to be the instrument of similar oppression?

But French armed vessels are to make all these captures in violation of the treaty, and we are to suffer all these vexations in violation of reason and humanity, while we endure them from the English "without an efficacious opposition." And what opposition will be deemed *efficacious*? For all captures made by the British contrary to the law of nations we have, agreeably to that law, demanded satisfaction. The British have engaged to make us satisfaction; and commissioners are now sitting to liquidate those demands. What opposition could have been more efficacious? What further opposition can be lawful?

Instead of further comments on this subject, let me present to you some passages of Mr. Adet's letter of the 14th of July 1795.* ——In this letter he communicated to the secretary of state the decree of the committee of public safety of the 3d of January 1795, repealing the 5th article of the decree of the 15th of November 1794.† The latter violated our treaty by subjecting the property of the enemies of France on board American vessels to capture, and by adding to the list of articles contraband: It was therefore repealed by the former. Mr. Adet seized this occasion to make the following declaration. "You will see Sir (said he) in both [the decrees] the undisguised disposition and sincere desire of the French government religiously to observe the engagements it has contracted with its allies, and its readiness to redress infractions which have never taken place but from the impulse of circumstances."—"It is amidst her triumphs that the republic loves to give this striking mark of its fidelity. Victorious France knows no other concern than that of justice—no other diplomatic language than that of truth."——To this faith, to this justice, to this fidelity, we now make our appeal.

From the stile of Mr. Adet's complaint of the British being *suffered* to arm in our ports, it might be imagined the instances were numerous. None were *permitted*: the *actual* armaments were few: and are as old as the year 1793, and were represented by Mr. Genet to the secretary of state. "What answer (asks Mr. Adet) did the government give to the representations of the minister of the French republic in this respect? It said that these vessels sailed too suddenly; that it was not able to cause them to be stopped." The answer was given by the secretary of state in different words. "Those from Charleston and Philadelphia have gone off before we were known to the government, and the former indeed in the first moments of the war, and before preventive measures could be taken in so distant a port. In the case of the Trusty Captain Hale, at Baltimore, the governor of Maryland [illegible] gave and given orders to examine the vessel; "but she got off before the officer could get on board, having cleared out three or four days before"——I have not observed that Mr. Genet renewed his complaint with regard to any of the vessels, whence I suppose he was satisfied with the answers as indeed he ought to have been. The two English vessels that sailed from Philadelphia escaped even the vigilance of the French consul—both had departed many days before he had been informed of their [illegible]. This is stated by the consul himself in a letter of the 21st of June 1793, to Mr. Genet. And yet the government is now charged by Mr. Adet with violating the treaty because it did not stop them!—Although the consuls of the United states had been required to be watchful, and to report all illegal armaments in our ports, yet it was natural for the government to expect positive information from the French consuls, who, doubtless were charged by their own government to be particularly vigilant in regard to all attempts at fitting armaments by the enemies of the republic. Mr. Adet remarks that "Some inhabitants of the United States had aided in these illegal armaments of the enemies of France"—and asks, "what measures were taken against them?" Was any search made to discover them?—to prosecute them? Never"—Yet the very letter from Mr. Genet to the secretary of state, in which and its inclosures Mr. Adet has found this subject of complaint, suggests a different conclusion. "I learn with pleasure (says Mr. Genet) by your letter of the 23d of this month [June 1793] that the governor of Georgia have caused to be stopped a vessel armed in that state, for the purpose of cruising against the French, and that the persons interested in this vessel will be prosecuted."

I shall say but a few words on the subject of the letters of which Mr. Adet complained that they remained unanswered. The letter of Sept. 29th, 1795) contained those [illegible] insinuations which were recalled in my letter of the 1st of Nov.‡. Why were these introduced by him if they were not to be applied? An answer was draughted on the subject of his letter, with animadversions on those insinuations: but desiring to avoid irritations the answer was not sent. It was deemed of less consequence, seeing in my letter to Mr. Monroe of the 15th of Sept. 1795, the resentments and reasonings of the government on that and other subjects relating to France had been fully expressed, to enable him to make immediate communications to the French government itself; and it was hoped that the informations given in that letter, and in others written to him the preceding summer, would have furnished ma-

* 10th Nivose 3d year.
† 25th Brumaire 3d year.
‡ State papers, p. 41. June 30, 1795.
§ State papers, p. 42.
‖ State papers, p. 40.

terials (and that these materials would have been timely used) for such representations as would have satisfied the French government, that the United States, in forming the treaty with Great Britain, had only exercised an indisputable right; and neither by that treaty nor any other act had infringed a single article of our treaties with France.

On the subject of the impresses of our seamen, mentioned in Mr. Adet's letters of March and April 1796, I shall only add, that nothing was more notorious than that those impresses had excited universal resentment in the United States, and been the subject of repeated remonstrances from our government to the British court. Thus in Mr. Pinckney's note to Lord Grenville in August 1793, which was published here that year, in the same collection of state papers with Mr. Jefferson's letter of Sept. 7th*, which Mr. Adet has quoted and on the 5th page next succeeding it, we find the following: "Under this head, it may be observed, that for want of arrangements being made for the security of American seamen in the ports of this country, (England) they are subject to the various hardships Mr. Pinckney has so frequently detailed to Lord Grenville." And in the next page, in his letter to Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Pinckney says—"The protection afforded our seamen remains also on the same footing: these (the British government) profess a willingness to secure to us all real American seamen, when proved to be such; but the proof they will not dispense with." To remove as far as possible the embarrassments arising from this cause, and more effectually to protect our seamen, was the object of a bill pending in Congress, and the subject of public debate, at the time I received Mr. Adet's letters.—This bill was passed into a law.

All these facts demonstrated that the government did not assent, but on the contrary that they resisted the impressment of American seamen: and this resistance has been continued: consequently we cannot be charged on this ground with a violation of our neutrality.

Among the former subjects of complaint not now renewed by Mr. Adet, is that against the government for permitting the purchase and exportation of horses, by British agents, in the course of the last winter and spring. The correspondence on this subject is lengthy; and yet the question lies within a very narrow compass.

Perhaps no article now better established than that neutral nations have a right to trade freely with nations at war; either by carrying and selling to them all kinds of merchandizes or permitting them to come and purchase the same commodities in the neutral territory: to the latter case, not refusing to one power at war what it permits another to purchase; with this exception in respect to articles contraband, that if the cruisers of one of the belligerent powers meet at sea with neutral vessels laden with such articles destined to the ports of their enemies, the neutral vessel may be captured, and the contraband goods will be lawful prize to the captors; but the residue of their cargo and the vessels themselves are to be discharged.

But if there were any doubt on this point under the law of nations, there can be none in relation to France, and the United States, because this matter is specially regulated by their treaty of commerce. This treaty so far from *restraining* the trade of either party remaining neutral, while the other is engaged in war, *provides regulations agreeable to which it should be carried on.*

The 23d and 24th articles authorize either party that is at war, to stop the neutral merchant vessels of the other destined to the ports of an enemy upon just grounds of suspicion, concerning the voyage or lading. If on examining the ships papers, it appears there are any contraband articles on board, "consigned for a port under the obedience of his enemies," she may be carried into port, and the contraband articles may, by regular proceedings in the admiralty, be confiscated; "having always power to stop the ship itself as any other goods found therein, which by this treaty are to be esteemed free: neither may they be detained on pretence of their being as it were infected by the prohibited goods, more than that they be confiscated as lawful prize." It further provides, that if the master of the neutral ship shall be willing to deliver the contraband goods to the captor, and the latter receive them, then is the neutral ship to be forewith [illegible] and allowed freely to prosecute her voyage. The 23d article goes further—if the [illegible] ship shall have on board the *enemies* of the other, "they are not to be taken out unless they are *officers in actual service.*"

These articles are so explicit, it may seem strange that a doubt should arise concerning them; I presume no doubt did arise: for Mr. Adet, overlooking these provisions of the treaty, demanded that the government should stop the exportation of horses by the British, upon the principle that it was a neutral duty required by the law of nations. An answer was given to his demands, in which the regulations of our treaty with France were particularly brought into view, as well as the rules of the law of nations. Mr. Adet, however, after some time renewed his claims; but again kept the treaty out of sight. An answer was given to these renewed claims; and we heard no more of the subject until the French privateers in the West Indies began to capture American vessels which had horses on board. You will find among

* Mr. Adet, by mistake, dates it September 25th.

the documents on this subject the copy of a decree of the citizens Victor Hughes and Le bas, the special agents of the executive directory in the windward islands, condemning an American vessel and her entire cargo, for having a small number of horses on board—not bound to their enemy's but to a neutral port. And the special agents ground their decree on the advice they received from Mr. Adet, under the date of 14th Messidor, being July 2d, 1796 This vessel and cargo were thus condemned without the sight of a single paper belonging to her: the master had them in his pocket, and would have brought them home, but for the recollection of the interpreter, some hours after the sentence of condemnation had been passed. These citizens exercised indeed a very brief authority. The process in the case of a second American vessel, which to complete her lading, had taken on board nineteen horses, but which was also bound to a neutral port, was in this form. The captain having come before one of the agents, he without any previous examination or hearing, addressing himself to the captain, pronounced sentence in these words—"I have confiscated your vessel and cargo"—closing the sentence with approbious language.

Mr. Adet, on the 18th of May last, revived his predecessor's claim of *right* by treaty to sell their prizes in our ports. This occasioned a correspondence on this subject, which you will find among the documents collected on this occasion. He contents himself, however, with considering it as a right granted not positively, but by *implication*. That is, because the treaty *forbids* the *enemies* of *France* to sell *their* prizes in our ports—Therefore, it *grants* to *her* a right of selling *her* prizes. As if my friend's *denial* of a favor to my *enemy* was in fact a *grant* of the same favor to *me*. The simple statement of the ground of the claim would seem sufficient to shew that the treaty will not support it. That sales of French prizes have been at all permitted, was owing to the *indulgence* of the government. This indulgence continued until it interfered with a new positive obligation: an obligation precisely the same that France itself contracted eight years *subsequent* to her treaty with us, *and with the same power*. This obligation is found in the 24th article of our treaty and the 16th of the French treaty, with *Great-Britain*. Thus France and the United States alike engaged to permit no enemy of Great-Britain to arm privateers in their ports, *or to sell their prizes there*, or in any manner to exchange them. Consequently had France remained at peace, and we engaged in a war with Great-Britain, our privateers would not be permitted to sell their prizes in French ports. And by the maritime law of France*, prizes, except they are taken from her enemies, can stay in her ports no more than 24 hours, unless compelled by tempest to remain longer; and the sales of such prizes are forbidden under severe penalties. But notwithstanding the certainty of our right to forbid the *sales* of prizes in our ports, and notwithstanding the express legal command of the chief justice of the United States, holding a circuit court in South Carolina, in May last, prohibiting the sale of a particular prize (the British ship Amity) at Charleston—the French agents sold the prize *vessel*, and the sale received the *formal* sanction of the French consul. Yet even this affair has been made a subject of complaint by Mr. Adet because the collector of that port refused a clearance to the prize vessel thus sold, in defiance of the authority of the United States; and because he also delayed, until, in a new case, he should get advice, to permit the exportation of the cargo of the prize ship, which on a survey had been reported to be irreparable.

Indeed the French minister has discovered an aptitude to complain. I may cite as instances, his letters of the 9th of January and 3d of March, 1796: the former, because the colors of France, which he had presented to the United States, were not permanently fixed and displayed before Congress: the latter because, some printers of almanacks or other periodical publications, in the United States, in arranging the names of the foreign ministers and agents resident amongst us, had placed those of Great Britain before those of France and Spain. Mr. Adet desired my declaration in writing, that the government of the United States had no concern in printing the works in which the agents of the French republic were registered after those of Great Britain, and that the works themselves might be suppressed. I gave him an answer in writing, with my consent to his publishing it in the newspapers, agreeably to his request. The answer states, that in matters of this kind the government did not and could not interfere. With regard to the colors, I must observe, that in what concerns our foreign relations, the president being the sole representative of the people of the United States, they were properly presented to him. He received them with all possible respect and directed them to be deposited with our national archives, that both might be preserved with equal care.

It remains to notice, a summary of complaints exhibited by M. de la Croix, the French Minister for foreign affairs, to Mr. Monroe, our Minister at Paris under the date of March 9th, 1796, to which the latter returned an answer, under the date of March 15th. These were inclosed in Mr. Monroe's letter of the 2d of May, and received at the department of state on the 9th of July. Copies of both papers & an extract of so much of his letter as relates to this subject, are among the documents now collected.

1st. Complaint—The inexecution of treaties.

2d. The courts of justice have taken and still take cognizance of prizes bro't by French privateers into the ports of the United States.

3d. English ships of war have been admitted into those ports, even in cases prohibited by the 17th article of the treaty: that is, when they have made prizes on the French republic or its citizens: and have also conducted thither their prizes.

3d. The consular convention has in two points become illusory. 1st. For want of giving to the consuls the means of having their decisions executed in all disputes between Frenchmen, of which the consuls have the exclusive cognizance: 2d. Because the judges charged with issuing warrants for apprehending French mariners who desert, require the original roll of the crew to be first produced. 4th. The arrest of the corvette Le Cassius and her Captain.

Second Complaint—The impunity of the outrage committed on the republic in the person of its minister, the citizen Fauchet, by the English ship Africa, in concert with the vice-consul of that nation, within the waters of the United States.

Third Complaint—The treaty concluded in 1794, between the United States and Great-Britain.

Excepting the second complaint, relative to the attempt of the English ship Africa to seize Mr. Fauchet and his papers—and the 3d article under the first complaint relative to the consular convention, all the charges in this summary have been already examined, and we think proved to be unfounded.

As to the consular convention, many inconveniences would attend the giving to the consuls a jurisdiction to the extent contended for on the part of the French republic, to be exercised by French consuls in the United States, and consequently by American consuls in France. The inconveniences are manifestly so great as to require very explicit language in the convention of the two nations on this subject, to authorise the conclusion that such an enlarged jurisdiction was intended. It would be to erect in foreign countries complete courts of justice, with effectual process to compel the appearance of parties and witnesses, and to execute their decision. And as the transactions in commerce and navigation could not in the nature of things be confined to the foreigners alone, the citizens of the country must often be necessary witnesses to those transactions and of course rendered amenable to this foreign jurisdiction in their own country: whereas the jurisdiction demanded is only of French consuls over French citizens in the United States; and reciprocally of American consuls over the citizens of the United States in France. From these considerations a presumption would arise, that the jurisdiction contemplated in the consular convention was to be merely *voluntary*, but at the same time *exclusive of the court of the country*. An examination of the convention we believe will support this and no other construction. The 11th article provides that all differences and suits between Frenchmen in the United States, and between citizens of the United States in France, and particularly all disputes between seamen and their captains, and between captains of different vessels of the nation shall be determined by the respective consuls, either by a *reference to arbitrators*, or by summary judgment, and *without costs*. "No officer of the country, civil or military, shall interfere therein, or take any part whatever in the matter."—This last clause alone would seem sufficient to repel the claim we are considering. Sheriffs, Marshals, and their deputies cannot aid in the execution of consular decisions, because they are "officers of the country" expressly forbidden to "take any part in the matter." But was it meant, that the laws should give consuls the power to appoint such executive officers of their own nation? We find no such thing in the convention. On the contrary, in the case of deserters from vessels mentioned in the 9th article, whom the consuls are authorised to cause to be arrested, they are expressly directed to apply in writing to the "courts, judges, and officers competent to make the arrests; meaning the courts, judges, and officers of the country where the consuls reside. Besides, if power could be given to consuls to appoint officers to execute their decisions, those officers must of course have their fees of compensation to be paid by one or other of the parties; but the 11th article declares that the consular judgments shall be "without costs."—To these observations I subjoin the deliberate opinions of two respectable lawyers, Mr. Harrison of New-York, and Mr. Bradford, the attorney general of the United States. "I have considered the 11th article of the convention between his late most Christian Majesty and the United States of America, and also the act of Congress concerning consuls and vice-consuls, as far as it prescribes the duty of marshals of the United States, and it is my opinion that the marshals are not bound by law to execute any sentence of a French consul, arising under the said article.

RICHARD HARRISON,
Attorney United States, for the New-York districts.

New-York, 6th month, 1794."

"I have considered the convention and act above referred to, and I perfectly coincide in the opinion given by the attorney of the United States for the district of New-York.

WM. BRADFORD,"

"Philadelphia, March 24, 1794."

The other complaint under this head is, that the judges who are charged (by an act of Congress) to issue warrants of arrest against deserters from French vessels have required the *original* ship's roll to prove that the men alledged to have deserted were a part of the crew; in contempt of the 5th article, which admits in the tribunals of both countries copies certified by the consul.

If we look at the 9th article of the consular treaty we shall see that the consuls who demand the arrests of deserters from vessels of their nation, must prove, "by an exhibition of the registers of the vessels or ship's roll, that those men were a part of the crew." It is apparent that the original roll, and not a copy is here referred to; nor indeed is the contrary pretended; but it is said that the 5th article admits certified consular copies as evidence in the courts of both nations. But the 5th article appears to have no relation to the subject of the 9th. It stipulates that "the consuls respectively shall have the exclusive right of receiving in their chancery, or on board of vessels the declarations and all other act which the captains, masters, crews, passengers and merchants of their nation may choose to make there, even their testaments and disposals by last will: and the copies of *the said acts*, duly authenticated by the said consuls, under the seal of their consulate shall receive faith in law, equally as their originals would." The ship's roll (or shipping paper) of a vessel's crew is not an act to be done before the consul, but the evidence of a private agreement between the captain of a vessel and his crew; and when he alledges that any of them have deserted, the 9th article requires this original evidence of the fact to be produced to the judge as the ground on which he shall issue his warrant to arrest them. And this is the construction put on this article by the judges; and for ought I know, without any deversity of opinion. The difference alledged by Mr. Fauchet in one of his letters to the secretary of state I have enquired into: and find he was under a mistake. And the mistake arose probably from this circumstance, that when from the information of the consul there was danger that the deserter would wholly escape, unless instantly apprehended, the judge has issued his warrant to arrest and bring before him the alledged deserter; but when brought, that judge has not committed the man, or delivered him to the consul, unless the original roll was produced to prove him one of the ship's crew.

As to the outrage against Mr. Fauchet by the Africa man of war, in attempting to seize him and his papers within the jurisdiction of the United States, and capt. Home's insult on their authority, I do not know what measures more efficacious could have been taken by the executive than those which were adopted, to obtain satisfaction. After waiting a reasonable time for explanations on the part of capt. Home, and of Mr. Moore, the English vice consul, and receiving none, the President revoked the exequatur of the vice-consul, and desired the governor of Rhode-Island where the Africa had been lying, to communicate to capt. Home the demand of the President. That he should immediately remove from a station within the jurisdiction of the United States, where he had violated their rights; and further to make known to him, that in forty eight hours after the requisition should be communicated to him all intercourse between the citizens of the United States and his ship should be forbidden. It is very true that the exequatur of the British vice-consul was withdrawn expressly for his knowingly transmitting to the governor of Rhode-Island a most insulting letter from capt. Home: because although he was on board the Africa when the attempt was made against Mr. Fauchet, the President had no evidence of his co-operation. The minister of the United States in London, was directed to represent to that court the conduct of capt. Home, and to demand his exemplary punishment. It was not to be expected that he would be judged unheard; and consequently much delay must have ensued. From her station on the coast of North America, the Africa went to the West-Indies. Seeing some time since by an article in the newspapers, that the Africa was returning to England, our minister in London was reminded of this affair, that the demand of satisfaction might be renewed.

Although the subject of M. de la Croix's third and last complaint (the British treaty) has been already discussed, allow me here to make a few remarks. He says, "it will be easy to prove that the United States in this treaty have knowingly and evidently sacrificed their connections with the republic, and the most essential and least contested prerogatives of neutrality."—The *reverse* of what the minister considers *so easy to prove*, we think has been *demonstrated*. Our legally binding connections with France we always considered as being formed by our treaties: and we say with confidence that we have not "knowingly violated these in a single article. If individuals have at any time infringed them, the government has been sincere and diligent in its endeavours to redress the wrong. If the ties of affection, of warm enthusiastic friendship have been weakened, the cause is to be sought for not in the acts of the American government; which have been constantly directed to the preservation of our peace with all nations. These ties did not depend on treaties. It was our friendship to France, contracted during our revolution, and our partiality for the cause of liberty and self government for which she engaged in *her own*, that made us endure numerous injuries almost without complaining. We were not willing to ascribe to the republic the outrages of her ministers against the laws, the sovereignty and the dignity of the United States, or the exceptionable stile of their communications. Even when for such flagrant aggressions, often repeated, we desired the recal of one of their ministers, it was done in the most soothing language, and in the mean time, lest the interests of the republic should suffer, he was permitted to exercise his functions in all cases in which those interests could be affected. When his successor arrived, he officially requested that the offending minister might be apprehended, that he might be sent to France—but the government, satisfied by his removal, declined the measure. Some irritations were experienced from that successor—what sensations have been produced by Mr. Adet's notes, your own feelings, on the perusal, will enable you to judge. If he intended to excite the general indignation of our citizens, he is not disappointed: but it is presumed this was not the object. After an exhibition of complaints in a stile so exceptionable, he could add but one more improper act, that of publishing his notes in the newspapers; he had scarcely transmitted them to the executive, before he forwarded them to the printer for publication.

From the foregoing statement, we trust it will appear, that there has been no attempt in the government of the United States to violate our treaty, or weaken our engagements with France. Whatever resistance it has opposed to the measures of her agents, the maintenance of the laws and sovereignty of the United States, and the neutral obligations have rendered indispensable. That it has never acquiesced in acts violating our rights, or interfering with the advantages stipulated to France—but, on the contrary, has opposed them by all the means in its power: That it has withheld succours from France that were compatible with the duties of neutrality to grant—that were by their independent political rights, and by the express provisions of the commercial treaty with France, the United States were at full liberty to enter into commercial treaties with any other nation, and consequently with Great Britain: that no facts manifesting partiality to that country, have been, and may be added, that none such can be produced.

Of the propriety and justness of these conclusions you will endeavour to satisfy the French government; and conscious of the rectitude of our own proceedings, during the whole course of the present war, we cannot but entertain the most sanguine expectations that they will be satisfied. We even hope that this has been already accomplished, and that you will be saved from the pain of renewing a discussion which the government has entered into with regret. Your mission and instructions prove its solicitude to have prevented this necessity, and the sincerity of its present hopes, that your endeavours, agreeably to those instructions, "to remove jealousies and groundless complaints, by shewing that they are groundless—to restore confidence so unfortunately and injuriously impaired—to explain the relative interests of both countries, and the real sentiments of your own," have been attended with success. And as a consequence thereof, we rely on the repeal of the decrees and orders which expose our commerce to indefinite injuries, which militate with the obligations of treaties and our rights as a neutral nation.

I have the honor to be,
With great respect,
Your most obedient servant,
TIMOTHY PICKERING.

Carefully collated with the original in the office of the department of state.
GEO. TAYLOR, jun. Chief Clk.

From the American Daily Advertiser, of the 6th of February.

An obliging Correspondent has favoured us with London papers to the 25th of November, brought by the Packet, of which the following are the most material contents.

LONDON, November 21.

Letters from Hanau, of the 7th inst. were received at Hamburg, a day after the departure of the mail from that city to Cuxhaven, stating, Gen. Bournonville had arrived in the island facing Nieuweid, and was making the most active preparations to attack the Austrians stationed in that quarter, under the command of Gen. Werneck. Great movements were also prevailing among the French troops on the left bank of the Rhine, and that part of the army of the Sambre and Meuse which was stationed on the Lahndruck, had received considerable reinforcements from the interior of France, and advanced to within the distance of one league of Mentz and Manheim.

The bombardment of Kehl by the Austrians was to have commenced on the 3d inst. but the weather had become so excessively bad and unfavorable, that it was thought that important enterprize must be relinquished for the present.

The Archduke Charles had sent off a considerable force from the Brisgau and Suabia, to keep in check the army of the Sambre & Meuse, whose spirit of enterprize and bold manœuvres began to disconcert the measures of his Royal Highness, who was daily expected either at Manheim or at Schwetzingen, having appointed General Latour to command the siege of Kehl.

By the same accounts we learn, that the Austrians were on the point of leaving the Sieg, and of concentrating their force on the right bank of the Rhine, between the Lahn and the Meia. The badness of the weather, the want of supplies, the scarcity of horses and waggons to convey the weekly rations to that part of the country, are assigned as the principal cause of that retrograde movement, which from the exhausted state of the countries between the Sieg & the Lahn, was expected soon to take place.

November 22.

Yesterday General Simcoe was appointed Governor of St. Domingo in the West Indies, and was sworn in before his Majesty in Council, at St. James's, with the usual forms. He is immediately to embark for his government.

The Electors of Hanover has positively refused to contribute any more money for the support of this calamitous war. We anxiously hope that the king of England will be induced to imitate the wise example of this pacific prince.

DECLARATION

Of the elector of Hanover to the Diet of Ratisbonne, on the subject of the imperial rescript of the 17th of October, 1796.

---

* Valin, Vol. 2. p. 27.

The Minister of Hanover has declared to M. De Hugel, the Imperial commissioner,

"That his Imperial Majesty has directly required his Majesty the King of Great-Britain and Elector of Hanover to furnish a new proof of his marked attention to the Germanic Constitution, by giving a great example, and acting efficaciously in concert with the Diet of Ratisbonne, not only that he may be rated for a sufficient quantity of Roman months, but by paying up all that remains due of his quota. It was declared at the same time that it was necessary the number of Roman months should exceed a hundred.

"His Britannic Majesty has replied to his Imperial Majesty, that he should not, nor was he able to anticipate the resolutions of his coestates; and that he was not at present in circumstances which permitted him to answer the demand which was made.

"That, since the periods when the last Roman months were granted, the system of the war had completely changed—That different states holding of the Empire had made a seperate peace, to avoid the total ruin with which their countries were threatened—That others had embraced Neutrality for the protection of their subjects; and that the prosperity these states enjoyed proved that they had attained a salutary object—That the affairs of the Empire had assumed quite another aspect; and that the relations of his Britannic Majesty, in his quality of Elector and Prince of the Empire were well known to be inconsistent with the Imperial demands, that he cannot, of course, consent to the granting of new Roman months for the continuation of this unhappy war; still far less can he contribute directly, since the Negociations commenced at Paris, from which it is expected a happy issue for the tranquility of Europe, and which are known to his Imperial Majesty, oblige his Britannic Majesty to avoid every proceeding that might give an unfavorable colour to his personal character."

November 25.

Extract of a letter from an officer stationed at St Marcau, dated Nov 19, 1796.

"The troops which for some months past had lined the French coast opposite to these islands, have marched from thence, being, as I am informed, ordered to reinforce the armies on the Rhine. Even the signal posts, which, previous to these encampments, were establish ed along the shore, now appear abandonned; so urgent have been the wants of the French government for men. All the gun boats have returned to England."

On Sunday evening Carpmeal and Taylor, two of the Officers, belonging to the Public Office, Bow Street, apprehended Capt W. of an American vessel, at a house in Rose bithe, on a charge of High Treason, in offering a considerable sum of money to a person to set fire to one of his Majesty's dock-yards.

STATE PAPERS.

LORD MALMESBURY'S EMBASSY.

NOTE

Addressed by Lord Malmesbury to the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The Undersigned does not hesitate a moment to answer the two questions which you have been instructed by the Executive Directory to put to him.

The Memorial presented this morning by the Undersigned, proposes in express terms on the part of his Majesty the King of Great-Britain, "to compensate France by proportionable restitutions, for the arrangements to which she will be called upon to consent, in order to satisfy the just pretensions of the King's Allies, and to preserve the political balance of Europe."

Before the formal acceptation of this principle, or the announciation, on the part of the Executive Directory, of any other principle whatever, which may equally serve as the basis of a Negociation for a general Peace, the Undersigned could not be authorized to designate the objects of reciprocal compensation.

As to the proof of the pacific disposition given to the French Government by his Majesty the Emperor and King, at the opening of the campaign, the Undersigned contents himself with a repetition of the following words contained in the Note of Baron D'Ehrleman, on the 4th of June last.

"The operations of the War will in no wise prevent his Imperial Majesty from being ever ready to concur, agreeably to any form of negociation which shall be adopted, in concert with the belligerent Powers, in the discussion of proper means for putting a stop to the farther effusion of human blood."

This Note was presented after the armistice was broken.

MALMESBURY.

REPLY

Of the minister for foreign Affairs to the preceding Note.

The Undersigned, in reply to your second Note of yesterday, is ordered by the Executive Directory, to declare to you, that he has nothing to add to the answer which has been addressed to you. He is also instructed to ask you, whether, on each official communication which shall take place between you and him, it will be necessary for you to send a courier to receive special instructions?

CHARLES DELACROIX.

Paris, 23d Brumaire, 5th year.

LETTER

Addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, by Lord Malmesbury, Envoy from the British Cabinet.

The Minister Plenipotentiary of his Britannic Majesty requests the Minister for Foreign Affairs to inform him whether he is to consider the official note, which he received from him yesterday evening, as the answer to that which Lord Malmesbury delivered yesterday morning to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, by order of his court. He applies for this information, that the departure of his courier may not be unnecessarily delayed.

MALMESBURY.

Paris, November 13, 1796.

ANSWER

Of the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the preceding Letter from Lord Malmesbury.

The undersigned Minister for Foreign Affairs, declares to Lord Malmesbury, Minister Plenipotentiary from his Britannic Majesty, that he is to consider the Official Note sent to him yesterday, as the Answer to that which Lord Malmesbury had addressed to him on the same day.

CHARLES DELACROIX.

23d Brumaire, }
5th year. }

SECOND LETTER

From Lord Malmesbury to the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Lord Malmesbury has just received the Answer of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, in which he declares that the Official Note which he sent to him yesterday, is to be considered as the Answer to that which Lord Malmesbury addressed to him on the morning of the same day.

Lord Malmesbury will transmit it this day to his Court.

MALMESBURY.

Paris, November }
13, 1796. }

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 4.

This morning died Mr. ANDREW BROWN; Printer of the Philadelphia Gazette.

The death of Mr. Brown is a close of that tragical scene which has already so deeply impressed the feelings of the community.

In this mournful event, society is much interested. As a citizen remarkable for vigor of mind and energy of conduct, Mr. Brown had few equals. His life had presented a succession of active scenes, in which his efforts, however connected with personal interest, were constantly directed to objects of general advantage. Of the goodness of his heart, the mournful event we record is perhaps the best evidence. He fell a victim, not alone to the corporeal injury received by the fire, but to that acute distress of mind which prevented him from surviving the loss of almost every object his heart held dear.

This is only given as the hasty tribute of professional friendship. We promise our readers, hereafter, more particular biographical sketches.

What a contrast has been exhibited by our administration in their conduct towards Great Britain, and that which they are pursuing towards France. Mr. Jay threw himself on the *magnanimity* and *justice* of his Britannic majesty, for a redress of the injuries our commerce had sustained from *his* cruisers acting under *his express orders*. Now that a breach with France threatens, our Executive talk big, defy their power and upbraid her for the part she took in our revolution. Far from feeling a gratitude for her assistance in *men* and *money* at the time that tried mens souls, our Executive have discovered, and they tell the French so, that their conduct at that time was *selfish* nay PERFIDIOUS. Is this the mode of bringing about a reconciliation? No, certainly. But a reconciliation is not expected, is *not wished for*. France is to be provoked into hostilities, that our administration may find a *pretext* for a more close union with the English. An alliance offensive and defensive with that tottering monarchy is looked to; we are to be *colonised anew*, and this accounts for the good understanding that subsists between the Executive of the United States and the enemies of our revolution.

Extract of a letter, Charleston, Jan 7, 1797

"There have just arrived here from Halifax 9 seamen of the crew of the transport Elizabeth, formerly belonging to the division of capt. Barney, and which was taken upon this coast some months ago. The American Capt. who bro't them here has told me, that a great number of American vessels were daily carried into the ports of Nova Scotia, and that the English were in the Practice of impressing all their seamen, and giving in their stead French Prisoners."

February 6.

The British packet arrived on Friday evening at New-York. She is said to have sailed about the 9th Dec. We do not find that she brings any thing very important.

Lord Malmesbury remained in Paris;—but had not accomplished the object of his mission.

The Diana, Ingraham, from Liverpool to Georgia is taken and carried into France.

The ship Hannibal, Clouser, of this port from Amsterdam to Lisbon, was lost on the 29th September near Callais, capt. and crew saved.

The mournful catastrophe which has lately overwhelmed the family of Mr. Brown, the printer of the Philadelphia Gazette, in this city, attained its full height on Saturday morning, by the death of Mr. Brown himself of an inflamation of the lungs, occasioned by the large quantity of smoke and mephitic air which he had imbibed, before he was extricated from the fire.

This shocking extinction of a whole family, furnishes matter for serious reflection, which the Moralist may pursue for the benefit of his species, and which the giddy and dissipated ought to improve to their reformation. We trust it will also operate on all ranks of people as a cautionary lesson to be careful in respect to that resistless element which has occasioned this direful calamity.

The remains of Mr. Brown were interred yesterday morning near those of his family in St. Paul's grave yard. His funeral was very numerously and respectfully attended.

Dr. Magaw (agreeably to the notice he gave on performing the funeral rites upon the first melancholy occasion) yesterday afternoon, in St. Paul's Church, preached a most affecting discourse to a very crowded audience, in reference to this singularly distressing event, from Job, ch. 3, ver. 7.

"*Lo, let that night be solitary; let no joyful voice come therein.*"

Extract of a letter from New-York, dated Feb. 3, 1797.

"*The packet is arrived which sailed the 7th of December; as yet no other news has transpired, but that Negociations for Peace had ceased.*"

RICHMOND,

TUESDAY, February 14.

It were well, if instead of the bitterness and contumely of party contention, men would learn to cultivate the amiable and endearing ties of good fellowship. To permit party poison to polute the sacred fountain of friendship, and extend its baleful breath into the sweet comforts of society is robbing life of half its meeting comforts. Is the "path of life to carpeted with joys," that we need press cause of discontent into its transitory period? To soften that asperity which a difference in political opinion produces in the heart should be the study of every man, whatever his sentiment or whatever his situation. What is the world but one wide family, on which the common parent looks with an eye of equal protection and impartiality! How absurd, then, to dash the draught of life, with the nauseous dregs of jealousy, malice and contention! Let men consider their fellow men, like themselves fallible, and not attribute to depravity of heart, that, which simply construed, is but an error in judgment. Let them leave personal invective, for manly argument, and, endeavor to convince, rather than to irritate each other. Let reason prescribe bounds to enthusiasm, and difference in opinion cease to be considered as proofs of base principles and sinister designs!

[Indep. Gaz.

From the ALBANY REGISTER.

Messrs. Barber & Southwick,

The letter from Paris, announcing with much confidence, that the celebrated Gen. Buonaparte is an American—a native of Middleton in Connecticut—whose original name was SHA, [illegible]—has excited no small degree of curiosity, and doubts as to the authenticity of the letter as well as to the fact itself. Having taken some pains to ascertain the fact, in the course of my enquiries, I have been credibly informed, that Mr. John Fellows, of New York, received a letter from his friend in Paris of which the extract published relative to Buonaparte, was a literal copy. Although we can hardly flatter ourselves that America can claim the honor of having produced the great Buonaparte; yet it cannot be amiss to state a fact which materially corroborates the letter received by Mr. Fellows; which is, that a gentleman by the name of Shaler (also a native of Middleton, Connecticut) who has resided in this city for several years, says, that on or about the year 1780, a brother of his, then about 12 years of age, sailed from Stratford (Con) in the capacity of a cabin boy on a Letter of Marque; that he proceeded board to the Mediterranean, and was taken; since which no accounts have been received from his brother; but the family have always supposed him to be living somewhere in the Mediterranean; and further, that he was a very active lad, and displayed an uncommon strength of mind for his years. Volney the traveller, when in this city, asserted, that Buonaparte had married a lady of fortune, and owned a farm adjoining his in Corsica.

These circumstances serve in some measure to reconcile the pleasing fact; and it may be observed, that the striking analogy it bears to similar cases which have come under our observation, renders it the easier of belief, that in early life young Shaler was transferred by accident from captivity into the arms of fortune. It is well known, that the celebrated Lafayette, a native of Virginia, whilst a boy, rose into rapid consequence in Europe, where his superior talents, and the elegance of his person and manners, caused his company to be courted by Princes and Nobility.

INVESTIGATOR.

—DIED—

January 30th, at her house in Goochland, ELIZABETH WOODSON.—Altho' she assumed not to rank amongst the *great*, yet she was truly honorable—a long life spent in uprightness of heart and plainness of manners, enabled her in Christian composure, to consider the awful change, as a happy entrance to a glorious immortality.—May her numerous offspring, who condole her removal, be animated to pay the most grateful tribute to her memory, by patterning her example.

On Sunday morning last, after a long and painful illness, Mr. MARCHAND, of this city.

BLANK

Bills of Exchange

Are for SALE

At this PRINTING-OFFICE,

THE CELEBRATED AND THOROUGH BRED HORSE,

BOXER,

NOW in high perfection, a fine bay, well marked, clear of all natural blemishes, fifteen hands one inch high, remarkable for his beauty and great strength, stands the ensuing season at my stable in Goochland county, within 3 miles of the Courthouse, and will cover Mares at the moderate price of TWENTY DOLLARS the season, or SEVEN DOLLARS the leap, to be paid at the stable door, and SIX GUINEAS to ensure a mare with foal, but the Twenty Dollars may be discharged by the payment of Fifteen Dollars, if paid within the season, which will commence the 10th of March and expire the 10th of August ensuing; good and extensive pasturage well enclosed (gratis) and great attention will be paid to mares, but no responsibility for accidents. BOXER is admitted by good judges to be one of the finest horses on the Continent. He was got by the imported horse Medley, his dam by Col. Baylor's Old Fearnought, his grand dam by old Jolly Roger, out of a full bred imported mare. The dam of Boxer was also the dam to the noted running horse, old Tantrum, and the black horse owned by Col. Larkin Smith.

BOXER's fame as a foal getter is so well known, nothing need be said on this head; His colts that have been tried on the turf will do credit to any horse in this country. The performances of Leftridges, colt in November last at Aylett's Ware-house in King William, was great indeed, young and untried as he was. He won the purse with much ease, tho' opposed to some fast running horses which had been proved.

JOHN CURD.

Goochland, February 11, 1797.

N. B. Gentlemen may have their mares fed and servants boarded on reasonable terms.

BOXER may be bought at the expiration of the season at the price of One Tousand Pounds, seven hundred and fifty was offered for him during the last Session of Assembly, by a gentleman of undoubted credit.

JOHN CURD.

February 11, 1797. (tf)

RICHMOND THEATRE.

LEARNED DOG.

Mr. SALENKA, lately from Europe, presents his respects to the Ladies and Gentlemen of Richmond and its vicinity, and informs them that he has brought with him a most surprising

Sagacious Dog,

TRAINED BY HIMSELF,

And purposes Exhibiting at the Theatre, *To-morrow evening*, Wednesday the 15th of February, 1797,

A variety of truly extraordinary performances with the Learned Dog.

Mr. SALENKA will also exhibit a number of surprising

SLIGHT of HAND TRICKS,

never performed by any person but himself. The particulars of which will be seen in the handbills, being too numerous to detail in a newspaper.

Mr. SALENKA, flatters himself the Performances will give universal satisfaction.

*** Boxes 4/6. Pit and Upper Boxes 3/.

☞ Tickets to be had at the Post-Office, at the Eagle-Tavern and at the office of the Theatre from 3 o'clock the evening preceding the performance.

†† Doors to be opened at half after five, & the performances to begin at half after 6 o clock.

RUN-AWAY SLAVES IN JAIL.

DAVID, a lad—He says, he is the property of Miss Elizabeth Newell of Prince George, who lives with her brother, Thomas Newell, a Cooper, on the road leading to Suffolk, about 6 miles below Blandford church; he is an artful boy and has a very scabby head, and is cloathed as common negroes.

TOM, the property of Col. William Hickman, of King-William, —and

JOHN, the property of Mrs. Mary Jones of Hanover.

Their owners are requested to send for them to

WILLIAM ROSE, Keeper.

Richmond, 31st Jan. 1797 tf.

TAKEN up by the subscriber living in Chesterfield county a BLACK STEAR, with grey hair at the end of his tail, appears to be about 12 years old, has been worked as an oxen, marked with a smooth crop in the left and a hole in the right ear, blind in the left eye. Appraised to three pounds.

THOMAS CHEATHAM.

January 27, 1797. *(3w)

Will be Sold,

TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER,

On the premises, on MONDAY the 20th inst.

The Tenement

In the town of Manchester,

BELONGING to Mr THOMAS DRUMMOND. Credit for eighteen months will be given to the purchaser—Bond and approved security required.

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL,
Attorney for
THOMAS DRUMMOND.

3d February, 1797. 3-w

WILL BE SOLD,

To the highest bidder, on Saturday the first day of April next, on the premises in the town of Manchester, agreeable to the last will and testament of Thomas Cretham, deceased, one third of the large three story

Brick-House,

Occupied at present by Mr. Robert Craig. Also Will be Sold, the one third of a BRICK-LUMBER HOUSE, 40 by 20 feet, and a BRICK KITCHEN, 16 by 14 feet—these buildings will suit any person who is in want of a store and dwelling house, there being four very convenient rooms in the second & third story, suitable for the reception of a family, with a complete store and counting room below. Those who may wish to view the houses, will be shewn them by applying to Mr. William Ball. One half of the money to be paid next Christmas, and the other half the Christmas after; no deed will be made until the first payment is made, then the purchaser giving bond with approved security to carry interest from the date if not punctually paid, for the balance.

February 1, 1797. (tdfd)

By virtue of a deed of trust made to me by THOMAS UNDERWOOD, *to secure the payment of four Bonds to* JOHN H. NORTON, *and four other Bonds to* DAVID COCKRANE, *dec,*

Will be Sold

To the highest bidder, for ready money,

AT Goochland Courthouse, the 3d Monday in February next, (it being Goochland Court day)

200 Acres of Land,

In Goochland County, on Licking-hole creek, Also 10,000 ACRES in the state of Kentucky. 5000 of which lies near the Big-Bone Lick, and is said to be equal to any land in that state, the other 5000 ACRES lies on Big Sandy, adjoining a large Survey of RICHARD GRAHAM's.

JOSEPH WATKINS, } Trustees
WILLIAM POPE, }

4th January, 1797. (tawit

TO BE SOLD,

On the second Thursday in March next, at New-Kent Courthouse,

Pursuant to a Decree of New-Kent county court, at six months credit,

A Tract of LAND,

Containing one hundred and ten acres, one negro man named Joe, one woman named Phillis, one girl Fanny, one girl Esther, one Horse, five head of Cattle, nine Hogs, three Feather Beds, with all other Household and Kitchen Furniture and Plantation Utensils, belonging to the estate of Nimrod Poindexter, deceased, to satisfy Richard Adams, seventy two pounds, fourteen shillings and seven pence, with interest from the 8th day of May 1788, till paid, together with the costs and expenses of the said decree. The COMMISSIONERS.

Jan. 17, 1797. (tdf)

TAKEN up by the subscriber at Richmond, the two following strays, viz. a SORREL HORSE about 5 feet high, 8 years old, three white legs, and the 4th foot white, a ball face, docked but not branded.—The other a LIGHT BAY, 4 feet 8 inches high, 8 years old, two hind feet white, also docked but not branded.—Posted and appraised, the Sorrel to one hundred, and the Bay to fifty dollars.

JOHN MAYO.

FOR SALE,

That Valuable PLANTATION,

whereon I now reside—called

DUNGEONESS,

Situate on the North Bank of James River, in Goochland county, about 11 miles from the Courthouse and nearly the same distance below Carter's-ferry; it contains over one thousand acres, of which 200 are low grounds, there are 400 acres of high lands in cultivation, and the remaining 400 hundred are in Woods—It is unnecessary to comment on the many advantages which attend this Farm—any person disposed to purchase, will no doubt examine the premises—I will observe however, there is a constant stream running thro' the land, on which may be erected to advantage a Manufacturing-Mill, on a small scale, and a Fishery belonging to it, which, from its peculiar situation is supposed to be among the best above the Falls. This tract may be bought for SIXTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS, and possession given as soon as the present crop is secured.

THOMAS ESTON RANDOLPH.

January 23d, 1797. (tf)

For Sale—That Valuable

Tract of Land,

CONTAINING two hundred and thirty acres, lying in the county of Powhatan, on the main road leading from Manchester to Cartersville, about 32 miles from Manchester, about 6 miles from the Courthouse and about 2 miles from the town of Jefferson, on James River. This Plantation has on it two good dwelling houses, a very fine apple orchard, a barn, and all other covenient out houses; the plantation is in fine order for cropping. The land will be sold for one or two years credit—Any person wishing to purchase may get further information by applying to Messrs. LYLE and M'CREDIE, in Manchester, Mr. WILLIAM MAYO, near Richmond, or to the subscriber who lives near the land.

SAMUEL H. SAUNDERS

January 24, 1797. (8w)

TEN DOLLARS REWARD.

ABSCONDED from the Subscriber's Farm at Warwick, in Chesterfield county, on the night of Wednesday the first instant—a negro man named

TITUS,

About 26 years of age, of a very dark complexion and middling stature, a flat nose and broad teeth, which he shews very much, is bad made, and walks with his knees half bent, has a dent in his forehead and a cut over one of his eyes; he carried with him a new blanket, white plains coat, red kersey breeches, short round jacket of bath coating, with a variety of other cloathing. I expect he will attempt to get on board some vessel in order to get to the northward, as a brother of his and several others have effected their escape that way.

All masters of vessels and others are cautioned against harboring him or carrying him out of the state. The above reward will be given & all expenses paid to any person that will bring him home or secure him so that the subscriber gets him again.

HENRY RANDOLPH.

Chester-Lodge, Chesterfield County, February 3d, 1797. } (tf)

EIGHT DOLLARS REWARD.

RAN AWAY from the subscriber, living in Henrico county near Richmond, on the 31st day of December last, a negro woman named

TEMP,

thirty years old, five feet five or six inches high, short and well made, has a down look and is very artful—has also a scar on the right side of her face, and was dressed in a blue petticoat and jacket. I purchased her of Mr Joseph Mosby some time last Summer. The above reward will be paid for bringing her home, if taken without the limits of this county, or THREE DOLLARS, if taken within.

JAMES HOUSLIN.

Dancing-School.

LOUIS ROUSSELL,

RESPECTFULLY informs the Ladies and Gentlemen of Richmond and its vicinity, that his School for Young Ladies & Gentlemen will be open (at his house on the cross street leading to Shockoe warehouse, formerly occupied by Thomas Walker, Taylor, where there is a comfortable room for the purpose) on *Wednesday the first day of March*.—Hours of attendance from nine to twelve in the morning, and from three to six in the evening, of Wednesday, Thursday, Friday & Saturday. Those who come from a distance may be accommodated with boarding with Mrs. Roussell.—A school will be opened at the Piping Tree in King William some time in March—One also in Manchester.—A subscription paper is left with Mr. Buckner for the purpose.

Mr. Roussell, with the utmost gratitude, returns his sincere thanks to the Ladies and Gentlemen of Richmond and its vicinity, for the liberal encouragement he has experienced from them these seven years past, and hopes by his future exertions to merit a continuance of their favors.——He begs leave to assure the public that attendance and assiduity may be relied on, and the greatest regard will be paid to decorum.——A line directed to L. R. will be duly attended to.

Richmond, Feb 6, 1797. (tf)

ALL persons having claims against the estate of the late JOHN BAGBY, deceased, are requested to make them known to the subscriber, on or before the 15th February next; as a sale and division of the estate will then take place, and every subsequent claim will be considered as barred by this advertisement.

W. O. CALLIS, Ex'r.

Louisa, January 14th, 1797. (3w

I HEREBY forewarn any person from taking or moving Wood or Timber of any kind from off the Land I purchased of the commissioners appointed to sell the lands of George Mayo, Esq. near Manchester in the county of Chesterfield.

JOHN HENDRICK.

Manchester, 4th Feb. 1797.

NOTICE.

ALL those indebted to the Estate of WILLIAM SPEARS, sen. deceased, late of Cumberland County, are hereby desired to come forward and discharge the same.—And all those who have claims are desired to present them for payment immediately, as the administrators are about paying off the legatees and closing the same.

WILLIAM SPEARS, } Adm'rs.
ROBERT SPEARS, }

Cumberland, 4th February, 1797. } (3t)

To be had of PRICHARD & DAVIDSON, or the PRINTER hereof,

THE

THIRD AND LAST

LETTER,

OF

ALEXANDER SMYTH

TO

FRANCIS PRESTON.

February 1st, 1797.

Ten Dollars Reward.

RAN-AWAY from the subscriber on the first of January last, a negro man, named

ROBBIN;

He is about 24 years of age, of a very black complexion, 5 feet 9 or 10 inches high; and on the 27th of the same month I have just reasons to suspect the said negro stole my horse—he is a small SORREL HORSE with a star in his forehead, and several saddle spots on his back. Any person that will deliver the said negro and horse to me living in the upper end of Goochland county, shall receive the above reward, and all extra charges that the law allows.

JOHN DANIEL.

January 30, 1797. (4t)

Robert Gamble,

Has IMPORTED, *in the ships Charles Carter, the Citizen, the Madison, the Hannah, and the Industry, from* LONDON & LIVERPOOL, *a* VERY LARGE *and* GENERAL ASSORTMENT *of*

Fall & Winter

GOODS,

And a variety of New and Fashionable ARTICLES, which he will dispose of on *moderate terms*, by the PIECE or PACKAGE, at his Wholesale Store in this City.

The friends of Gamble & Temple OF RICHMOND,

And of Gamble & Grattan, OF STAUNTON,

Are respectfully informed, that by the above arrivals, their Assortment of

MERCHANDIZE,

Is now rendered very complete, and being enabled to sell at prices that will not fail to meet the approbation of purchasers—they hope to merit a continuation of those favors from the public in the line of their occupation, which they have hitherto experienced.

All kinds of merchantable produce, will as usual, be received at the respective stores, and the most liberal prices allowed.

Richmond, Oct. 18, 1796.

Henry Lewis,

(Opposite Mr. Crawford's New Medicine Store.)

BEGS leave to inform the public, that he has removed his store from opposite the Market House to the one lately occupied by RICHARD LEWIS, of whom he has purchased his stock on hand, which added to his own, makes a General Assortment of Seasonable

GOODS;

which he will sell remarkably cheap for CASH or COUNTRY PRODUCE.

Richmond, January 5th, 1797.

Thomas Hooper,

Begs leave to inform the public and his friends in particular, that he has lately received, a General assortment of

GOODS,

SUITABLE TO THE

Fall and Winter Season,

—ALSO—

A few CRATES of QUEENS-WARE, Which will be sold low for CASH or COUNTRY PRODUCE.

Richmond, Nov. 18, 1796. (tf)

NOTICE.

THE subscriber is fully authorized to adjust all claims for and against the estate, of the late RICHARD RANDOLPH, Jun. Esquire, of Bizarre, in the county of Cumberland.—It is requested therefore, that all those who have claims against the said estate, either by bond, bill, note or otherwise, will make them known immediately, that provision may be made to discharge the same without delay. Those who are indebted to the said estate, are requested to make immediate payment, as no indulgence can be given after the first day of March next. CREED TAYLOR.

Cumberland County, Needham, January 10th, 1797. } (6w)

TAKEN UP by the subscriber about five or six weeks ago, a CHESNUT SORREL MARE, four feet eight or nine inches high, blaze face and her near hind foot white half way her legs. Posted and appraised to £. 18.

EDWARD DENNIS.

Charlotte, January 28, 1797. }

JUST PUBLISHED,

And for SALE, at SAMUEL PLEASANTS *Printing-Office, Richmond;*

BANAKER's

VIRGINIA, PENNSYLVANIA, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, and KENTUCKY

ALMANACK,

AND

EPHEMERIS,

FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD

1797.

FOR SALE,

The VALUABLE PLANTATION

I LIVE on about 4 miles from Richmond, lying on the river adjoining the locks of the James river Canal, containing 405 acres, near 200 of which is valuable meadow and part of which is now in timothy. On it is a good two story Dwelling House with five rooms and a passage of 40 by 12, kitchen and other necessary out houses, a barn 40 feet square 2 story, the lower one is of 12 feet, built with stone; there is on this plantation, as valuable a stone Quarry as any in the state, the Bridge at Richmond being built from it, two fine Apple and Peach Orchards—also a great variety of other fruits, equal to any in America—Likewise another TRACT, on the North side of the main road about the same distance from Richmond as the other, containing 400 acres, about 150 of which is cleared, the rest in valuable Oak, Pine and Hickory timber; on this plantation is a Dwelling-house, with 4 rooms, (out of repair) good Apple and Peach Orchards. I will sell the whole together or in such parcels as may suit the purchasers, for which I will give extensive credit on the interest being punctually paid annually, or I will take good Lands in Albemarle, Buckingham or Cumberland, in payment, provided they are such as I approve of in quality and price.—Bond with undoubted security will be required for payment of the purchase.

DANIEL L. HYLTON.

January 25, 1797. (4woaw)

AT a meeting of the TAILORS in the City of Richmond, on Tuesday, January 31st, 1797, at Mr. Charles Cox's Tavern, it was agreed—That the price of work hereafter should be as follows—For Superfine Cloths, Velvets, Thicksets, Silks, &c. Six Dollars per suit; Coarse Cloths, Thin Stuffs, &c. Five and a half Dollars per suit; for cutting out not less than Two Dollars per suit; Negroes and Children's cloths are excepted.

(3t.)

NOTICE.

THE Subscriber is about to remove to the Western Country, therefore he requests all those who may have demands against him to come forward and have them settled.—He also requests those who may be indebted to him, either by bond, note or open account, to make immediate payment, or he shall be under the disagreeable necessity of bringing suits against them without discrimination.

DANIEL GORDON.

Manchester, January 29th, 1797. } (t. f.)

For Sale,

ABOUT TWO THOUSAND

Acres of Land,

Lying in Buckingham County,

ON the road from New-London, 75 miles from Richmond, & 40 from Cartersville; and of the estate of ANTHONY WINSTON, deceased. The land is well, with about five hundred acres cleared; with tolerable improvements, and is of great value for its quality and situation. The payments will be made easy; the land divided into lots to suit purchasers; and will be shewn by Mr. JOHN JOHNS who lives near. For further particulars, enquiry will be made of

EDMUND WINSTON.

Campbell County, Sept. 12th, 1796. } (tf)

For Sale.

A VALUABLE TRACT OF

LAND

IN Hanover County, twenty miles from Richmond, and within one and a half of Pamunkey river, Apply to

SAMUEL TOLER.

January 6, 1797.

Negroes for Sale.

ON Monday the 6th day of February, at Charlottesville, being Albemarle Court day

FORTY LIKELY

NEGROES.

And on the 20th of the same month, at Amherst Court house, being Amherst Court day, FORTY OTHERS will be exposed to sale.—These Negroes are extremely likely—The terms of Sale are, one half Cash, and the other half payable on the first day of January 1798.

JOHN RANDOLPH, Jun.

Cumberland County, January 8, 1797. } (t d f)

Wanted to Purchase,

Military Lands,

For which the highest price will be given by

HICKS & CAMPBELL.

FOR SALE

AT

LADD, ANTHONY's and CO's.

A QUANTITY OF

Red Clover-Seed.

January 6th, 1797.